



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Equivalent of War." "Instead of military conscription there should be a conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years a part of the army enlisted against nature. . . . The military ideals of hardihood and discipline would be wrought into the growing fibre of the people."

Only by teaching peace can we have peace. It is possible to teach peace today. In every school throughout the land we can begin to show that peace and not war is necessary for civilization; that we can live heroically for our country and serve her better than by dying for her. We can make the youth understand that the man of most worth is he who has done something to lighten the labor

of others; who has increased their happiness; who has decreased their pain; who has broadened their appreciation for the beauty of man and nature. He will clearly see that war, except it be for national independence, is merely organized destruction. He will have a deep contempt for him who relies upon the belching of cannon and piercing of bayonets to settle questions of right and wrong.

And then when some discerning few wish to hurl their nation against another the citizens trained in the ideals of peace will regard these traitors with astonishment and disgust, and remain steadfast in the glorious paths of peace.

## COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING FOR BOYS IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND. DO WE WANT IT?

By WILLIAM C. ALLEN

**C**OMPULSORY military training of lads fourteen years old and upward in Australia, and sixteen years old and upward in New Zealand, has been so thoroughly exploited in some quarters that an investigation into the practical operation of such a system, or its dangers, is justifiable at the present time.

Compulsory military training is claimed by some of its advocates to be different from conscription, but in practical operation it proves to be the same. The Defense Act of New Zealand of 1909 was made possible by the agitation of the National Defense League and by influences originating in England. The visit of the United States fleet to Australia resulted in a great wave of military enthusiasm spreading over that land, and one of the developments connected therewith was the demand to arm. The result of a combination of circumstances, seized by the militarists to their own aggrandizement "without any direct reference to the will of the people," and backed at first by some well-meaning educators, was that the men of those countries put their defenseless boys under military discipline to which the voters would not themselves pretend to submit.

Figures supplied by Arthur Watts, organizer of the Australian Freedom League, revealed extraordinary conditions. Even registrations were difficult to get. He shows that in Australia in 1913, despite the fact that the military officers had power to register boys without their parents' consent, the number liable to prosecution for non-registration at the end of the registration period was 7,324.

Official figures quoted in the "Melbourne Age" of 31st of May, 1911, disclosed that to that date the total average attendance for Australia at the statutory parade drills was 59,562 out of the total strength of 88,859 senior cadets (18 years old and under) stated by the

The writer in this letter not only calls on recent personal observations in the antipodes, but is also indebted to the publications of the New Zealand Freedom League and the Australian Freedom League, "Conscription in New Zealand and Australia," "The Repeal" and others.

military authorities to be in actual training. The percentage of absentees from drill ranged from about 31 to 52 per cent. The "Age" adds: "It is plain that large numbers of cadets are shirking their legal obligations."

There have been very many prosecutions of boys under the system which in both countries is known as the Defense Acts. Non-attendance at drill from almost whatever cause necessarily constitutes a basis for prosecution. In the city of Auckland, New Zealand, of about 90,000 population, during the twelve months ending at an early date last year, there were, not counting withdrawn cases, a record of 770 prosecutions. There are reported, for instance, as many as 50 defense prosecutions in the police court of the little city of Invercargill, N. Z., at one time.

The administration of prosecutions has been very severe in many cases. The act in both countries provided alternative services and assumed relief for members of denominations opposed to military service, but no relief for the many others who resisted drill because of religious or other conscientious principles. Here are a very few sample prosecutions reported:

Sydney Crossland, a Quaker lad, was, on account of religious scruples, sentenced to fifty days' detention in Victoria Barracks, Sydney being released before half the time had expired. The Minister for Defense is reported as saying that immediate action would be taken to punish the "unruly" cadet. He was visited in a cell by a member of the Freedom League.

"Victor Yeo, a lad of fourteen, was, on August 25, 1913, sentenced to one month in Broken Hill jail. His release was ordered after serving twenty days, but he served the full term, including another imprisonment of twelve days." A good deal of this time he was on bread and water diet, and for ten days of his second imprisonment he was locked up in a cell for twenty-two out of twenty-four hours.

"J. and W. Size made a statutory declaration that in September, 1913," when in detention in Ft. Largs, they were placed on bread and water diet in a cell with a

stone floor. One night nine lads were in the cell, which was about 12 by 9 feet. They had only one blanket each—it was in early spring in that country—contrary to the regulations which provide for three blankets. On a second occasion John Size was kept in solitary confinement for ten days continuously.

"Arthur E. Ettridge was prosecuted in Adelaide in September, 1913," for failing to render personal service. His mother and a physician, Dr. D. W. Ray, gave evidence that the lad had been too ill to work. In spite of this the officer pressed the case, demanding ten shillings cost, which was refused.

"On the 21st of December, 1913, W. Bennett, of Dulwich Hill, N. S. W., was for the second time charged with preventing his son from drilling." He stated to the court: "I have conscientious objections to my boy being compelled against his will to become a soldier." He was fined twice. He had already been in jail for refusing to pay a fine in connection with the same matter.

The writer, when in Australia, met with equivalent cases. Australia seems to have become anything but a free country since it established juvenile military drill. These conditions are not, as far as I can learn, indicated in government reports or mentioned in circulars for intending immigrants.

John F. Hills, M. A., a well-known educator of Australia, has recently stated that in times of peace military imprisonment was inflicted on "over 4,000 Australian boys and youths."

The effect of military drill has been bad. The school-master aims to make the child think for himself, which is exactly the reverse of the work of the drill-master. Dr. Howse, F. R. C. S., V. C. (gained in South Africa), of Orange, N. S. W., says that the present system of drilling boys is distinctly injurious to boys of nervous temperament. It creates indigestion, and distinct physical injury has resulted. He denies the physical benefit of military drill in view of the number of such cases, and states that twenty years of age is early enough to begin training. Thus the "*Age*, February 18, 1914," when citing some of the hardships connected with the training camps, tells of how a medical examination revealed numerous cases of acute dilation of the heart, etc.

The New Zealand Freedom League in its first annual report, 1914, when discussing the prosecutions in police courts which were found necessary in connection with the enforcement of military drill, says: "There are many instances of ludicrous absurdity, many of shameful injustice, and altogether one is impressed with the fact that boys from fourteen years upwards are compelled to mix with the worst characters off our streets, to hear of filth and crime from which they should be protected, simply because they object to being brutalized by the agents of war or because they happen to have been absent from parade." There has also been much testimony to the moral damage done to lads in detention barracks and jails and also to those who willingly participate in the drill.

Those who are opposed to drill from conscientious or other reasons are often called "liars," "unpatriotic," "traitors," etc., and it is insisted that they do not know whereof they speak. Claims as to the presumed success of military discipline do not seem to be justified by facts.

Colonel Heard, when explaining to a committee his difficulties connected with the act, is reported to have said: "We are placed in a humiliating position; we are open to all kinds of insults; to all kinds of insubordination; and we are perfectly helpless."

An oath is demanded of the boys, which, in New Zealand, is as follows:

"I, — — —, do sincerely promise and swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to our Sovereign Lord, the King, his heirs and successors, and that I will faithfully serve in the New Zealand military forces according to my liability under the Defense Act at present in force, and that I will observe and obey all orders of his Majesty, his heirs and successors, and of the generals and officers set over me until I shall be lawfully discharged. So help me God."

This oath, we are told, was often forced by threats of fine and imprisonment on boys who were drilling and on those whose parents refused to consent to their boys binding themselves to so drastic a surrender of their consciences into the keeping of the military authorities. We may easily conceive of the attitude created in the minds of thousands of lads at a most impressionable age toward governmental authority, when many are thus compelled to take oaths and others are placed in a position of disobedience to parental control.

"The Lyttleton *Times* of the 17th of June, 1912," when speaking of the scruples thus invaded, declares that the objections of parents to their children assuming solemn obligations in this airy fashion should be respected. But the hard facts indicate that after once surrendering to military influences it seems almost impossible to secure religious or civil freedom. They have gone.

"Before New Zealand came under the iron heel of militarism the only person who could inflict a fine upon any one was a magistrate. But today a military officer can impose fines on the boys under his care at his own sweet will, and, what is far more serious, can cause that fine to be collected by a policeman out of the lad's wages" (if he works for wages).

From what the writer can learn the Military and Naval Board in both countries has acquired an undesirable influence and power over the teachers of state and private schools.

The general unpopularity of these conditions in Australia is proved by the fact that, according to the carefully collected reports of the Australian Freedom League, in two and one-half years up to the last day of 1913 there were 22,143 prosecutions of young people from fourteen and upward. There have been additional prosecutions since then. This was in a population of 4,500,000 persons, or about twice the number then in the State of California. Some church people and labor unions whose working lads are affected very much by such laws have been bitterly opposed to military drills. The Amalgamated Society of Engineers of New Zealand, when speaking of the Defense Act, appealed "to all thoughtful citizens to do their utmost to stem this drift into barbarism."

Any efforts to establish military drill in the schools of a democracy carry with them tendencies that are in direct opposition to the moral and political ideals that these schools are primarily intended to develop.

Military instruction for boys is not a valuable moral factor, but in practical operation is apparently the reverse. It does not tend to improve the national health, or seem to foster the sort of discipline that is wanted. The most satisfactory discipline for boys is that which in many excellent schools is obtained without the temptations and moral damage of military associations. The training of children in military ideals, however well intended, is a retrograding step. It tends to lure them from gainful pursuits towards illusive militarism. The burden eventually falls heaviest on the poor. It strikes at civil freedom and in practice leads to compulsory tyranny. A well-known clergyman of New Zealand has said of it, "It represents paganism *in excelsus*." To maintain this system a propaganda of jingoism and international fears has to be promoted in the community. Even Germany has not taught her boys how to kill. Shall we out-Prussia Prussia?

If you give the military or naval advocates an inch they will take an ell. You never know how far they will lead you. Militarism is the same the world over—first ingratiating, next seductive, then remorseless. Do we want it? Do we want even the thin edge of militarism introduced into our public schools?

## A MUSSULMAN ON WAR AND CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION

By HABBIBOLLAH, AIN OL MOLK

[An Advanced Mussulman]

No FIERCE and hungry lion, no sharp-clawed and angry tiger, no furious wolf, is more bloodthirsty than the civilized man of today.

This same civilized man, who has attended universities and studied sciences, spends his time, energy, and wisdom in preparing hellish instruments and in inventing infernal machines, deadly guns and cannons, warships, and aeroplanes. Why? In order to destroy the business of commercial cities, to change palaces into graves, and to close up all the avenue of escape of his kind, shooting them down from every side with volleys of bullets.

This is the calling of civilized man of this century. What wild animal is there who can smear a thousand of his kind with blood? This bravery, this nobility, is especially reserved for the civilized man of this enlightened era. As soon as he puts the crown of power upon his head and ascends the throne of might and strength, with a cruel heart, as hard as stone, he snatches the first-born from the weak and helpless mother, from the old, decrepit father; he leaves the sister in the last extremity of grief, the widow alone with her sorrow, the little children fatherless.

For their own covetousness, selfishness, and passion they send millions of youths, like flocks of sheep, to the place of slaughter, to shield themselves from the bullets of the enemy; just for killing and being killed—murder.

Who is the enemy? And why this animosity? The enemy is another herd sent to the place of slaughter by another civilized man, and the animus is to seize the land of others; and the only difference between these two civilized men is that one is the offender and the other the defender, but both sides are cruel and deadly destroyers.

The teachings of spiritual and heavenly-minded men of all the nations of the world prohibit the shedding of human blood and condemn the murderer to death; but this civilized man, on the one hand, signs the order for the universal slaughter of his own kind and tries in all possible ways to put an end to the human race, while, on the other hand, he kneels in temples and mentions the name of God in great humility, and asks His help in exterminating his fellow-men and begs Him for victory and triumph.

It is thus that affairs are conducted in the name of the king, regent, governor; and when they are done in the name of the subject, the actions and dispositions are still more surprising and maddening. Millions of educated young men go to the place of execution like senseless sheep. They do not even ask the question: "What are we going for? Why should we be killed? Why should we kill our brethren?" They appear as if they had no will, their only stimulus being the words of those civilized chiefs; and for the sake of one such word they relinquish property, wife and children, to sacrifice their lives for the greed of possessing the land of others.

They hasten to the arena where the only mattress and pillow is the ground and the only cover is the canopy of heaven, where their nourishment is often limited to a little bread and water, and there is no other hope in their despairing hearts except the anticipation of death. They go to roll thousands of their own kind in dust and blood, and they attain in death an excess of ecstasy, as if they had revivified some one.

Behold the success of the wisdom of this century! Is this the boasted civilization of Europe, upon which our eyes, the eyes of all of Asia, have been gazing with longing? Is this the ultimate result of the science and wisdom of Europe? The emperors and rulers of the Christian world named the former Sultan, Abdul Hamid, "The King of Blood," and proclaimed themselves as the pure mirror of Christ. These are the civilized Christians of the world, who look upon the Mussulman as a murderer and barbarian, and who call themselves the supporters of Christ's teachings and the spreaders of Christian morals!

Let these civilized men act as they please, even murder one another; but while doing so, it is not reverent that they should call upon the Name of the Almighty, the Powerful. He who detests the odor of blood is far distant from the cruel and selfish.

The true civilization and the real humanity, which is the source of the well-being, comfort, and peace of the human kind, depends upon following the teachings and the holy commands of the Almighty God, and everything outside of this means destruction and extinction, as you are now witnessing.

"Reflect upon this, oh ye possessors of insight!"

[Translated at Teheran, Persia, by Nanuchera Khan and Susan I. Moody, M. D.]

. . . A resolution urging President Wilson to use the good offices of the United States for the limitation of armaments in all countries, with a view to insuring peace after the war, was adopted at the thirty-ninth annual meeting of the New York State Bar Association. The resolution, read to the association by Everett P. Wheeler, chairman of the committee on armaments, was passed without opposing argument or a dissenting vote.